



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_50956
Title of the Manuscript:	Rationalization of water consumption for taro plant through the rationing of irrigation and expand the plant ability to resist stress conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript words account: according to authors' guidelines, Original Research Article should not exceed 6000 words (including everything). This manuscript has 14339 words, more than two times the recommended number of words. • Abstract words account: 545 words instead of 300 words max. • Keywords: 9 key words (instead of 4 to 8) • Many long sentences: many sentences introducing results are too long and need to be shortened to ease understanding. • The in text references style: when an author is cited at the beginning of the sentence or referred as "by [author]", the best style should be author name et al. [number]. Example: 1. Matthews et al. [1] reported ...; 2. Similar result was reported by Mergedus et al. [2]. • Literature review repeated in discussion section: the literature review that help you state your problem in the introduction should not be repasted as it in the discussion section but should be used to explain and highlight the result. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are agree with reviewer and we done all the required corrects in the manuscript. - Some paragraphs were deleted from the research according to the required amendments - We reduced the manuscript as possible. - We reduced the abstract - long sentences had been shortened in the manuscript - We are correct the references style. - We are justified the repeated review.
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables: some tables are placed far from the comment referred and others have no comments referring to them. • Number of reference: the number of references can be considerably reduced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some tables were moved from their places into other suitable parts in the research and made some adjustments according to the required amendments
Optional/General comments	This paper is a very good and interesting research work. However, there is so many results that the author has to reorganise the presentation of results to reduce the length and avoid repetitions in the manuscript. This work is a good contribution in the promotion of this orphan crop (taro).	Thank you very much sir for your effort in improving this manuscript to be the best.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	We are agree with reviewer and we done all the required corrects in the
--	--------------------	---



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

		manuscript.
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	